



# Texas Emergency Management Advisory Committee

---

Wednesday, August 3, 2016 Meeting Minutes

COUNCILS, COMMITTEES AND WORKING GROUPS	ACRONYM	TDEM FACILITATOR
Drought Preparedness Council *	DPC	Josh Bryant
Emergency Management Performance Grant Working Group	EMPG	Susan Vessell
Emergency Tracking Network Advisory Group	ETN	Jeff Newbold
First Responder Advisory Council*	FRAC	Tim Loveland
Post Incident Response Team	PIRT	Tim Loveland
School Safety Task Force*	-	Susan Vessell
State Hazard Mitigation Team	SHMT	Sherri Copeland
State of Texas Emergency Assistance Registry Committee	STEAR	Gisela Ryan-Bunger
Technology Committee	TC	Jeff Newbold
Texas Disability Task Force on Emergency Management	DTF	Gisela Ryan-Bunger
Texas Emergency Management Advisory Committee	TEMAC	Michelle Gonzales
WebEOC Administrative Group	WebEOC	Jeff Newbold

\*Legislatively mandated

#### TEMAC MEMBER ATTENDANCE

Ronnie Bates	Dr. Charles Bauer	Leonard Deonarine
Eric Epley	Dale Little	Crystal Lyons
Sharon Nalls	John Owens	Bob Royall (Chair)
Sarah Somers (Vice Chair)	Dr. Denise Walker	Michelle Gonzales

#### GENERAL ATTENDANCE

John Andee, DPC	Doug Bass, TC, WebEOC	Bryan Becknel, TDEM
Ken Bell, FRAC, PIRT	Josh Bryant, DPC	Gisela Bunger, STEAR
Eric Carter, FRAC	Russell Cook, DTF, STEAR	Chris Connealy, FRAC
Sherri Copeland, TDEM	Seth Christensen, Observer	Todd Early, FRAC
Regina Erales, DTF	Ammy Gierzak, DTF	Ricardo Gonzalez, EMPG
Danielle Hale, EMPG, STEAR	Danielle Hesse, DTF, STEAR	Stan Hopfa, SHMT
Nim Kidd, TDEM	Ernst Kiesling, SHMT	Tim Loveland, TDEM
Jeff Newbold, TC	Juan Ortiz, EMPG	Frank Patterson, EMPG
Kris Ramsey, TC	Richard Retz, FRAC	Steve Rosa, DTF, WebEOC
Michael Segner, SHMT	Larry Shine, DTF	Mark Sloan, TC
Spencer Somerville, Observer	Laura Stough, DTF	Lawrence Trevino, FRAC, EMPG
Jennifer Suler, DTF	Susan Thorne, DPC, SHMT	Susan Vessell, TDEM
David Villarreal, DPC	Gordon Wells, STEAR, Drought	Ted West, TDEM
Bruce Woods, SHMT		

#### OPENING REMARKS (CHAIR ROYALL AND VICE CHAIR SOMERS)

Chair Royall provided opening remarks. He spoke briefly about TEMAC's reorganization and expressed excitement for the transparency, collaboration and efficiency the new organization will provide. He also asked for a moment of silence to honor fallen law enforcement officers. Chair Royall encouraged all to capitalize on the opportunity to develop or strengthen relationships with other attendees and encouraged all to exchange business cards.

Vice Chair Somers noted she initially dreaded attending multiple meetings over a period of two days, but was invigorated as she attended the first day's meetings and witnessed the promotion of collaboration, communication and determination of best practices as a group. She also expressed hope that all in attendance would also be as invigorated as she through this new adventure.

#### ATTENDEE INTRODUCTIONS

Attendees introduced themselves and provided their title, agency and the committee or council they serve on.

#### REMARKS FROM CHIEF KIDD

Chief Kidd thanked all for their participation in the committee and subcommittee meetings. He emphasized the importance of their work and how each of them through their service can positively impact their and other

jurisdictions. The reorganization will provide the vehicle to ensure transparency, communication and collaboration and eliminate redundancies that negatively impact efficacy.

Chief Kidd provided a brief review of the [Governor's EMS and Trauma Advisory Council's](#) (GETAC) structure and how TEMAC is now being modeled after it. Similarly to GETAC, he would like to open future TEMAC meetings to first responders and emergency managers so they will have a voice in future efforts and ensure the rule and policy makers understand and know what stakeholder needs are.

He briefly discussed his preferences for the makeup of the subcommittees and cited two important preferences:

- TDEM staff should not chair any of the subcommittees.
- Subcommittees should be comprised of subject matter experts who are never afraid of offending him and telling him exactly what he needs to hear.

He emphasized candor is paramount for those who serve and for continued effective dialogue.

Chief Kidd noted the current committee structure is fluid and that only three councils are set in law (DPC, FRAC and the School Safety Task Force); the others are good ideas and if discussion is needed, he wants those conversations to occur. He stressed he is open to good ideas and does not want the process to be about TDEM; instead he wants to know what is needed from TDEM and each other.

#### **REORGANIZATION DISCUSSION (VESSELL, SUSAN)**

Susan echoed Chief Kidd's statement regarding the fluidity of the committee structure. She noted how recent disasters affected the reorganization process, specifically the timeline. She reviewed the most significant timeline impacts in the provided project management plan (PMP) and approximate timeframes for the next group meetings:

- November 2016, Texas EMS Conference
  - Meetings anticipated to be scheduled successively to allow maximum attendance.
  - First responders and emergency management coordinators to be invited to the meetings.
- May 2017, Texas Emergency Management Conference (TEMC)
  - First meeting that subcommittees written recommendations to be provided to Chief Kidd for consideration.
  - Process guidance for recommendation submissions to be provided to facilitators to share with their groups.

After Susan's report, Chief Kidd provided additional information on GETAC structure. He also outlined the [FEMA National Advisory Council \(NAC\)](#) process for submitting recommendations by subcommittees through the overarching group and then to FEMA. He concluded his remarks by noting this is the direction he wants the group to go and expects it to continue to evolve to better serve the community.

Chair Royall briefly reviewed the timeline in the PMP, page 10 specifically. He noted templates for notes and other documents to be used by TEMAC groups are being developed for consistency across committees. He also asked all to come to the next meeting prepared to provide written recommendations to TDEM through TEMAC.

#### **SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS**

Chair Royall noted all subcommittees have been tasked with developing a charter. He asked all to think out of the box and emphasized the charter did not have to be the same as what's been previously used.

##### **DPC (Bryant, Josh)**

Meeting topics:

- As of June 30, 2016, Texas was drought free.
- Current conditions favor La Niña for summer, fall and winter 2016, which indicates warming and drought conditions.
  - Presentation from the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) regarding the 2017 Water Plan. The plan provides statewide development and water conservation practices for water resources over 50 years (2020-2070). The plan is located at twdb.org (This URL is incorrect. The correct URL is <http://www.twdb.texas.gov/>)

Additional information can be found at <https://2017.texasstatewaterplan.org/statewide>

Current projects:

- 2016 threat and hazard identification and risk assessment (THIRA) update related to drought. Current scenario is San Angelo running out of water. The council was tasked with reviewing the THIRA, determining possible impacts and updating any numbers.
- Reviewing charter

Questions:

**Q:** Is the THIRA available for distribution?

**A:** No, per Chief Kidd.

**Q:** Is the THIRA (drought portion) from a statewide view or broken up into regions?

**A:** Specific to Central Texas but is applicable statewide.

**Q:** Where can previous council efforts and information be found?

**A:** <http://www.txdps.state.tx.us/dem/CouncilsCommittees/droughtCouncil/stateDroughtPrepCouncil.htm>

**Q:** What kind of information can be found there?

**A:** Past months' drought situation reports and general information about Texas' drought conditions over the years.

**Q:** How does the council tie into water development boards regarding ground water conservation? Is the council working with or is there representation of some of the ground water districts?

**A:** Yes, there are a few different representatives on regional subcommittees throughout the state. There's also several TWBD staff that are on the council.

**Q:** State or local people?

**A:** State.

**Q:** Is there local representation, especially from the ones from the aquifer?

**A:** Josh will have to get back with him.

**Q:** New emergency manager wants to know if there is more than one council out there that needs to be coordinated with?

**A:** Yes, within the council there are several subcommittees. Josh will provide his card so he can touch base with him later.

**Q:** Is there a drought task force?

**A:** Josh will check into that.

**Q:** Do river authorities participate in the council?

**A:** Yes.

Membership list posted on the screen.

After this report, Chief Kidd asked for a show of hands from those who did not know the organization existed. Several raised their hands. He noted the council is one of the three mandated by law. He explained there are three "buckets" of water that the council helps resolve issues with and asked if all agreed with his bucket analogy. They did. The buckets are:

- Emergency drinking water (Wal-Mart, HEB, American Red Cross)
- Institutional water (hospitals, jails, small cities, trucked water)

- Agricultural water (crops and animals)

Questions:

**Q:** Do the buckets include critical infrastructure?

**A:** It depends on the type of critical infrastructure.

**Q:** Is there part of the council that deals with wildfire contingencies if water is scarce?

**A:** Governing legislation does not focus on this; if change is requested, it requires change in law.

Suggestions made were:

- Coordinate with U.S. Geological Survey for forecast tools.
- Have discussions with hospitals prior to an event to assess water needs and address issues before an event.

### **EMPG (Patterson, Frank)**

Frank provided a brief history of EMPG and its purpose—to establish a funding mechanism (formula) for equitable distribution of EMPG funds. The committee was recognized by FEMA for establishing a best practice. They have completed their task and the committee is evolving to consider other areas impacting EMPG.

Meeting topics:

- Exploring membership parameters: To open membership to non-EMPG jurisdictions and how that can be done; would like to sustain current membership from small, medium and large communities. They would also like to include councils of governments. Overall desired makeup to be 90 percent EMPG communities and 10 percent non-EMPG communities.
- Establishing performance benchmarks for EMPG communities.
- Reevaluating previous recommendations.
- Developing best practices for communities and develop guidance for how it works using the tasking measures for reporting.
- Recommendations for what equipment should be in emergency operation centers.
- Charter (did not discuss in meeting)

Question:

**Q:** Is this a statute required committee?

**A:** No.

Vice Chair Somers noted the state does not have to pass through EMPG funds, yet it does to help local jurisdiction performance. She is excited this committee is evolving to assist local jurisdictions attain peak performance.

Chief Kidd noted prior to 2010 there was not a documented process that could explain or justify how money was awarded. He emphasized the committee was thorough and provided a program that was mathematically sound, defensible, non-political and with strict, enforceable standards. He also noted two communities, Webster and Round Rock, built strong programs through the metrics that were developed and have since left the program, freeing up funds for other communities. He stated the state receives around \$20 million annually in EMPG funds, of which, \$6 million is passed through to jurisdictions in the program. The remainder of the money pays for TDEM staff salaries, current networks and statewide projects.

### **ETN (Newbold, Jeff)**

Jeff provided a brief overview of its history. He noted ETN is now a state project that has an app for IOS and Android devices and runs in WebEOC. The app can be used in any jurisdiction and is available in the App Store— search for TEXETN.

Meeting topics:

- Provide more training and exercise on app use.
- Identify possible changes to the system and when changes should be implemented.
- Capability for connectivity between states that border Texas.
- Mapping app provided by Texas Department of State Health Services. Will get back to committee regarding availability.
- Repopulation and reentry, particularly after a man-made disaster.

Jeff encouraged attendees to consider membership and emphasized specialties he's looking for: shelter branch managers, transportation personnel and mass care coordinators.

Chair and co-chair selections are pending as well as charter development.

Questions:

**Q:** How is mapping connected to this conversation?

**A:** In the past, ETN was two systems (list of evacuees and map of state assets (buses only)). Jeff would like use available technology to have any vehicle that needs to be tracked, tracked using the current system if possible.

During this report, Todd Early noted regional exercises were being conducted and invited TDEM to participate. Jeff asked if anything is being done with the DPS Communications to let TDEM's Critical Information Systems know at [support@soc.texas.gov](mailto:support@soc.texas.gov).

**Q:** Asked to explain the differences between previous and current product.

**A:** Previous products that functioned in the old system do not function today. There are numerous challenges to integrating systems that are not WebEOC, IOS or Android—provided by TDEM. If there is a jurisdiction that wants to connect with WebEOC, get with Jeff. He cautioned there will likely be cost to this integration that is not covered by TDEM. This option is available to all Texas jurisdictions and other states, too.

**Q:** Does the version need to be 8.0?

**A:** No, but its best if it is, particularly when considering security. Get with your web administrator to find out what version your current system is.

**Q:** Some of the important criteria in the old system is no longer available today and is limiting situational awareness among jurisdictions (the determination to remove the criteria was made by DSHS, because it was considered not FNSS compliant). Can that be remedied?

**A:** Jeff offered to speak to DSHS about their recommendations. Jeff noted the code is still there, but hidden.

Comment:

- The product works and it's appreciated.

**FRAC (Epley, Eric)**

Eric provided a brief history of FRAC, its mission and regulating statute (See PMP for details).

Meeting Topics:

- Ken Bell provided an overview of PIRT. To learn more, go to [txpirt.com](http://txpirt.com).
- TDEM hired Russell Marshall to head up the Texas Emergency Management Assistance Team (TEMAT) program.
  - This is not an incident management team. It's not meant to manage a fire. It's for issues such as brush collection after an event where a PIRT expert can assist.
  - Collecting names of interested individuals. See Ken Bell after the meeting if interested.
- Deputy Assistant Director Todd Early, DPS Communications, gave a presentation on the Texas Statewide Interoperability Coordinator and interoperability. To learn more, go to <http://txlte.com/>

- MSAT channels are statewide.
- Programming code is now unique for every radio in Texas. It “de-duplicates” all radio IDs.
  - Will never have anything that seamlessly roams from point to point.
  - Cloud-based solutions and other mission critical systems being looked at to ensure situational awareness in most cases.
- Redoing memorandums of understanding (MOUs) for Texas Interoperability Communications Plan.
  - Changes in 6.25 and other narrow-band issues.
  - Expect to see MOU in six months.
    - Voluntary
    - Anticipated to be a downloadable template to be signed by emergency manager, elected officials and then returned.
- After action reports and protecting sensitive information.
  - Concerns
    - Difficult to affect change if personnel are fearful of being open and forthcoming.
    - Transparency is important, but consideration must be given to protecting sensitive and confidential information.
  - Discussions to continue.
- Workers’ compensation coverage for any state team member deployed who works for other agencies/companies.
  - Concerns
    - Volunteer fire departments (VFD) do not have the budget for workers’ compensation insurance.
    - Wage gap between main job and workers’ comp insurance.
    - May require legislation for volunteer fire departments, incident management teams, etc.
    - Could be impacting current and future volunteerism.
  - Proposed solutions
    - If VFD members want to be on a team, the VFD must have workers’ comp insurance.
    - [VFIS](#) gap insurance
- Todd Early provided a brief on First Net.
  - In 2010 all the national associations of public safety came together to lobby Congress. The result was 20 megahertz of spectrum—equivalent to AT&T and Horizon—for a nationwide public safety broadband network.
  - FirstNet will impact all jurisdictions as well as technology first responders will use for decades to come.
  - Course available at [txlte.com](http://txlte.com).
  - Major outreach is being conducted across the state to increase awareness and ensure requirements are met.
  - Briefings can be arranged if needed.
  - Roll out plan anticipated to be submitted to the governor by mid-2017.
  - System is for anyone who responds to disasters and daily public safety works.
  - Will go into effect for every state in the nation.

Questions:

**Q:** MOUs from TX-TF1 or IMT (starkly differently), do they pay portal-to-portal and has this been discussed?

**A:** No, but FRAC will be willing to take on the issue. Believes discussion has occurred regarding coming together under a single MOU and should be a larger group discussion of interested parties.

**Q:** Should this issue be tackled (posed to the group)?

**A:** Yes.

**Q:** Who thinks it makes the most sense to coalesce around one agreement (posed to the group)?

**A:** Most raised hands.

Issues with multiple MOUs:

- Confusing to jurisdictions deploying under multiple MOUs.

- MOUs created at different times for different reasons.
- Budgeting is different.
  - Deploying team members wait to deploy based on pay rate and benefits coverage of MOU.
- Reporting requirements are different.
- Ways to get funding back are different.
- Requires going to city leaders multiple times for multiple MOUs for the same person reporting to the same agency.
- Creates internal and external audit issues.

#### Suggestions:

- Have discussion about typing personnel.
- Follow the MOU used by TEEX to create a standard model.
- FRAC to develop position paper: identify the problem and possible resolutions.
- Include a rough draft with position paper to ensure conversation moves forward.
- Involve multiple stakeholders to develop draft.
- Chief Kidd noted all current MOUs have been through multiple legal reviews and vetted by the agencies, and he reminded all that state employees cannot lobby.

#### **School Safety Task Force (Vessell, Susan)**

Susan provided a brief overview of the task force, its creation and related legislation (SB 1556). See PMP for more information.

#### Challenges:

- Unfunded mandate.
- Overcoming campus versus district think.

#### Current projects:

- Working on legislative report due September 1, 2016.
- Working on outreach for National Preparedness Month in September 2016.
- Working on outreach for National Safe Schools Week October 16-22, 2016.

#### Questions:

**Q:** Are we still keeping in mind egress issues for fire safety (getting children out)?

**A:** Yes, part of the certification process requires schools to plan for and conduct drills for full life safety, which includes fire, active shooter, etc.

A member noted this was taught through the Advanced Law Enforcement Rapid Response Training (ALERRT) Center, too.

**Q:** Schools are not named participants in county mitigation plans. Is there anything at the state level to encourage participation?

**A:** Maybe. Certification requires school board president and superintendent sign their plans and that they share them with their local emergency managers. If this does not happen, the district cannot be certified.

Currently, there are over 1,000 ISDs in Texas. Only 161 have successfully completed the certification program, and 84 are pending. It is hoped parents will ask why their districts aren't certified. As we keep moving forward, the focus is to keep driving districts toward their local emergency managers to start having conversations about mitigation, preparedness, response and recovery. Chief Kidd emphasized that some mitigation funds cannot go to ISDs, but some projects can go on school property if the project is partnered with local emergency management.



**Q:** How is outreach going for charter and private schools?

**A:** There is no mandate for these entities.

**Q:** What about coordination when districts cross jurisdictions?

**A:** The mandate is built on the soil where the facility sits. If the school district is in 15 cities that's 15 programs they need to coordinate with.

**Q:** So the campus will be wherever the physical location of the campus is?

**A:** Yes, however, the district plan should incorporate all of the campus plans, and they should be coordinating with local emergency managers. Must have a campus specific plan that rolls up into a district plan.

**Q:** Is consideration in plans given to children with disabilities?

**A:** Yes, Section 2.2 of the questionnaire asks, "Does your school district rate the needs of students, staff and visitors with disabilities and others with access and functional needs into all aspects of the district comprehensive emergency management program including planning, training and drilling."

**Q:** Are there any resources for rural districts with limited expertise and experience to assist with plan development?

**A:** The Texas School Safety Center can assist. To learn more about available resources go to, <https://txssc.txstate.edu/>.

**Q:** Only the district signs the document, not the local emergency manager, is that correct?

**A:** Yes, they are self-reporting and by signing the district is certifying that it coordinated with the local emergency managers.

**Q:** Where do we find a list of certified districts?

**A:** Not currently aware if the information is on the School Safety Center website.

**Q:** What documentation is required to prove an ISD has met certification?

**A:** Right now the certification process and law is self-report. By signing, the superintendent and board president certify the districted completed all requirements, including coordinating with local emergency managers.

**Q:** Are there still planning tools on the School Safety Center website?

**A:** Yes.

Suggestions:

- Suggest letter be sent by local county officials to encourage participation in program and to coordinate with local emergency managers. May be a great way to open the door for communication and coordination.
  - If such a letter is sent, it should be sent to the superintendent or board president.

### **SHMT (Copeland, Sherri)**

Sherri provided a brief overview of SHMT's mission and makeup. See PMP for more information. SHMT is tasked with review of hazard mitigation assistance grant application review and to assist with the update and maintenance of the State Hazard Mitigation Plan.

She explained the process for FEMA to determine the fund amount:

- A presidential disaster declaration occurs —there have been six since 2015.
- FEMA provides a 12 month lock-in date after the disaster declaration, FEMA totals all the federal money spent (Individual Assistance and Public Assistance) for the disaster and multiplies that total by 15 percent.
- FEMA then determines how much money is distributed for hazard mitigation grants.
- These are competitive grants.

Meeting topics:

- Formalizing charter.
- Reviewing current processes.

Other information:

- Sherri provided a pie chart outlining Hazard Mitigation Grant Program and Pre-Disaster Mitigation funding from 2007 to 2015. She noted of the past six disasters, only one, DR-4223, has been awarded, \$33 million dollars.
- Two application periods for DR-4245 and DR-4255 are closed. Combined only awarded \$8 million dollars.
- Application periods for DR-4266, DR-4269 and DR-4272 are open.
  - Deadlines to turn in applications to TDEM are:
    - DR-4266 and DR-4269 October 31, 2016
    - DR-4272 January 20, 2017
  - TDEM's deadline to submit applications for DR-4266 and DR-4269 to FEMA is March 19, 2017.
- She asked all to keep in mind that funding can vary and is dependent on disaster size and to consider possible funding when putting together proposals.
- SHMT will be meeting in October 2016 to review applications for DR-4245 and DR-4255.
  - Considered applications due to FEMA by November 2016.
  - Awards will not be received until 2017.

Questions:

**Q:** Considered applications for new disasters will be sent to FEMA when?

**A:** The TDEM deadline is March 1, 2017.

**Q:** Awards will be issued when?

**A:** The process is long and can take up to a year after submission.

**Q:** There's a local match required?

**A:** Yes, 25 percent.

**Q:** What fiscal years would this impact?

**A:** This depends on when the award is received; it can take up to seven months for awards to be distributed.

**Q:** Are generators still a 50/50 percent match?

**A:** No, only safe rooms are 50/50 percent match. All else is 75/25 percent.

During this report, Chief Kidd interjected that FEMA rules are pretty open about how and where money is spent. The rules allow for the Governor's Authorized Representative to decide how the money is spent. Requests for money always exceed available funds by three to five times. So the 75/25 is the minimum cost share. The SHMT has done a good job reviewing applications and ensuring selected projects meet the FEMA required positive-cost benefit analysis ratio, but he sees opportunities for improvement to ensure a better outcome.

Prior to 2010, the team looked at each project and determined what the biggest bang for the buck was. Historical examples show there should be reconsideration on how projects are ranked and approved. He wants the team to use the following steps to determine how money is spent:

1. Top priority is impacted jurisdictions with credible projects.
2. Second priority is projects that mitigate the same disaster type that generated the funding. The money should follow the cause to reduce risks for the next event.
3. Third priority is the state's highest risks (Highest cost ability analysis or the propensity of the most lifesaving project).

A member suggested a fourth consideration be added that considers projects that cannot be funded by any other

means that has been carrying for years. Chief Kidd stated there are some strict FEMA rules to consider. One, it must be a one-to-one cost-benefit analysis. If it's less than that, it can't be done. The other concern is there are only certain percentages that can be done toward initiative projects.

Another member asked if another consideration can be added that allows for projects to be considered if the projects aren't for the current disaster, but within another presidentially-declared disaster within the past 12 months. Chief Kidd asked this be put in writing and sent through TEMAC. He noted TDEM is slowing down the process to allow for valid projects to be submitted. FEMA has provided a lock-in at six months to ensure less money won't be received, but he is not sure jurisdictions will be ready to submit at that point.

A member also expressed concern about getting local governments to initially commit and stay committed to the required 25 percent match. Chief Kidd expressed dismay at the amount of money returned because funding commitments could not be kept at the local and state level. He wants members to go back and look at the program to see if better recommendations can be made.

**Suggestion:**

- 50 percent of available funding goes to jurisdictions directly impacted and gives them different timelines.

Sherri also reminded attendees not to forget about Public Assistance funding that may be able to assist with recovery or mitigation.

**STEAR (Ryan-Bunger, Gisela)**

Gisela provided a brief overview of the committee. See the PMP for more information. Gisela noted that the original purpose of STEAR was to increase awareness of individuals that may need assistance during an evacuation, but the scope has expanded to allow STEAR to be used in other events in an all-hazards approach, such as identifying citizens who need assistance during significant power outages (Vice Chair Somers example).

**Meeting Topics:**

- How to close the gap between the number of current registrants and actual population?
- How to promote participation in and educate people from inland counties?
  - Combat citizen complacency.
- How to regenerate and increase engagement of local data custodians?
  - Need to ensure all communities that have registrations have data custodians.
- Suggested improvements to STEAR database:
  - Functional ease of access for users.
  - Future integration of STEAR data into ETN (benefits and disadvantages).
  - Review 2017 registration questionnaire for updates.

**Questions:**

**Q:** Who are the data custodians?

**A:** In most cases, the emergency management coordinator serves as the data custodian for their jurisdiction. In larger jurisdictions, it may be a dedicated individual.

**Q:** How many registrants are there?

**A:** There are 47,883 active registrants for 2016. Citizens must register every year. The annual process helps to keep data updated and current.

**Q:** Data custodians do not seem to be clear as to what's expected of them. Is there an effort to educate data custodians on their responsibilities?

**A:** Web-based training, STEAR-W, to be held August 23, 2016. Those interested can register at [preparingtexas.org](http://preparingtexas.org).

**Q:** Can STEAR be integrated with Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) or other legacy systems?

**A:** Let's have a discussion on this (task item).

**Q:** Is there a way to geocode data?

**A:** Yes, there's a solution that will cover 90 percent validation, but 10 percent of the data will require manual validation.

**Q:** Is there a current method to download data via a CVS file into other systems?

**A:** Yes.

**Q:** Can this be integrated with WebEOC?

**A:** This was discussed yesterday. It was taken off the table as an option because of the amount of "dirty" data that needs to be cleaned. If it can be geocoded on the front end, there will be less dirty data, but it will still need to be cleaned. This can create bad data.

**Q:** Is it better to have 90 percent good data on the front end than zero (regarding WebEOC connection)?

**A:** Let's look at it and determine if it can be achieved and how. It was noted that all data would have to be verified and not assumed that all is good data.

Another member noted that jurisdictions that have GIS capabilities would use geocoding. Jurisdictions that don't have GIS capabilities, even if the geocoding were perfect, would not use it. There was agreement that this is a local level issue. Another member noted that with current funding, the end of the road may have been reached regarding this enhancement.

**Q:** What performance metrics are available to gauge performance and success of systems in the jurisdiction?

**A:** The goal is a 100 percent registration of those who may need assistance. However, registrations fluctuate based on current factors such as hurricanes and other known threats. The goal is to keep educating and trying. It is also beneficial to use non-traditional partners such as home health care providers that can assist in educating individuals about this service. Another way to gauge success is to monitor increasing/decreasing registrations. In addition, its various uses should also be considered (See comments for this report).

**Q:** What is the goal statewide?

**A:** You can't have one not with this dynamic and fluid population. As before, it is hoped that all who may need assistance register.

Registrations average about 60,000 per year. Currently, on pace to reach that average. It was mentioned again that registrations fluctuate annually.

Comments:

Both Frank Patterson and Vice Chair Somers provided personal examples of how STEAR assisted them. Having STEAR assisted Patterson's jurisdiction with a Department of Justice audit. STEAR provided physical addresses of registrants. That data was integrated into GIS, and they were able to map the information. Vice Chair Somer's jurisdiction was able to use STEAR data to identify citizens who needed assistance after a significant wind event that created widespread power outages. Using STEAR, they found the one citizen who needed assistance.

A member noted STEAR can be used as a powerful planning tool in addition to a response tool.

Suggestions:

- Have STEAR communicate with mass notification systems, where surveys or calls can serve in place of physical visits to addresses.
  - Notifications, such as text, work with some demographics but not as well as others.

- Also agitated some citizens who later requested to be removed from the notification system.
  - Learning they have to craft different warning and information for different demographics.
  - Is it possible to setup selections on how messages are received?
    - Setting up the expectation that messages will occur. What occurs if it doesn't?
- Start discussions about collecting demographics and other information (Referred to the handout).
- Find options regarding geocoding.

### **DTF (Cook, Russell)**

Russell provided a brief overview of the committee's history and thanked those that have participated in the task force. He noted those that serve are volunteers. As a group, they have developed a FNSS toolkit, an effective communications toolkit and a quarterly newsletter. If not receiving the newsletter, contact Russell or Gisela to be placed on the mailing list. These efforts were recognized by FEMA for best practices. He encouraged attendees to look at and implement the tools created. He emphasized that he is looking for additional members and encouraged attendees to contact Gisela or him if interested. He also emphasized the committee is a proponent of submitting recommendations on paper.

#### **Meeting Topics:**

- Kelli Merriweather gave a presentation on texting and 911 and [Kari's law](#) (the ability to dial 911 without having to dial "9" first).

#### **Goals:**

- Have one member of the task force on each of the TEMAC subcommittees.
- Continue heavy presence in training and planning.
- Integrate to be a part of every management decision as whole community advocates.
- Get the message out that plans should be inclusive of all citizens; if not, the plans are incomplete.
- Develop ways to maintain current toolkits.

### **WebEOC (Newbold, Jeff)**

#### **Meeting Topics:**

- Large subcommittee to be split into two working groups to identify issues and develop viable solutions regarding WebEOC and GIS. Other subcommittees can bring WebEOC and GIS issues to these groups.
  - WebEOC Working Group
    - Focus on WebEOC administrators
    - Focus on standard training on and support for all WebEOC servers, over 40, in every state except New Mexico.
    - GIS integration for all servers in Texas and FEMA Region 6.
      - Integration for servers that border all states available everywhere except El Paso.
  - GIS Working Group
- New subcommittee: Technology Committee
  - Made up of emergency management coordinators and personnel who make operational decisions that technology brings to bear.
  - If WebEOC is the path forward, great; if there are other products to be considered, contact the subcommittee.
  - Those individuals who are emergency management coordinators will be moved to this group. Those who have dual roles as an emergency management coordinator and WebEOC administrators will be placed on both groups.
- Jeff asked attendees to let him know if WebEOC sign ons were needed for local servers or if they did not know if there was a local server. He can be contacted at [support@soc.texas.gov](mailto:support@soc.texas.gov).
- He encouraged all to make him aware of current needs. He cited the previous example of fields being removed as what he's trying to combat.

## GOOD OF THE ORDER

Jeff Newbold – Any subcommittee that has any technology, GIS or WebEOC questions or comments push those to the Technology Committee, and it will determine where the issue should go.

No other remarks.

## ACTION ITEMS

- Consider setting up the room in concentric circles or ovals at the next meeting to facilitate discussion.
- Send out link to Drought Preparedness Council information, <http://www.txdps.state.tx.us/dem/CouncilsCommittees/droughtCouncil/stateDroughtPrepCouncil.htm>
- Send out STEAR website URL, <https://publicregistry.csr.utexas.edu/enroll/>, and course link. <https://www.preparingtexas.org/ViewCourse.aspx?courseid=bfe4d1d9-c048-4c44-aa94-87931baf8b3c>
- Subcommittees to review and/or develop a charter.
- FRAC, and other interested stakeholders, to look into options to combine multiple MOUs into a single MOU and develop a position paper with a rough draft of MOU provided for discussion at the next TEMAC meeting.
  - FRAC and interested parties to meet before the November meeting to develop a working MOU draft.
- Send out Sherri's handout.
- Discuss feasibility of integrating CAD and other legacy systems' data with STEAR.
- Send out Gisela's handout.

## NEXT MEETINGS

November 2016  
Texas EMS Conference  
Dallas, Texas  
Dates and times TBD